

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
IBRAHIM ANNAN,

Plaintiff,

-against-

CITY OF NEW YORK POLICE
DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.
-----X

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
MEMORANDUM & ORDER
12-CV-2702 (CBA) (CLP)

FILED
CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.

★ FEB 16 2016 ★

CLERK'S OFFICE

AMON, Chief United States District Judge:

By Memorandum and Order dated September 18, 2015 (the “September 18 Order”), the Court denied pro se plaintiff Ibrahim Annan’s motions for partial summary judgment, judgment on the pleadings, and entry of default and granted in part defendants’ motion for partial summary judgment. (D.E. # 136.) Annan has since filed six different submissions totaling nearly 350 pages objecting to the Court’s September 18 Order. (D.E. # 142–46, 150.)

The Court liberally construed the first five submissions as a motion for reconsideration, which the Court denied by Memorandum and Order dated December 29, 2015, for failure to make the showing necessary to merit reconsideration—*i.e.*, “point[ing] to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked . . . that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court.” Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc., 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995). (D.E. # 149, Mem. and Order dated Dec. 29, 2015 (the “December 29 Order”), at 5–7.) In that Order, the Court cautioned Annan against further serial, voluminous filings, which continue to delay progress toward trial. (*Id.* at 8.)

Nonetheless, Annan subsequently filed a sixth set of objections, (D.E. # 150 (the “January Objections”)), which, for the reasons explained in the Court’s December 29 Order, the Court liberally construes as yet another motion for reconsideration of the Court’s September 18 Order.

Defendants now move to strike the January Objections and seek sanctions against Annan “for making another voluminous, incomprehensi[ble], and vexatio[us] submission.” Both applications are denied.

However, the Court agrees that the January Objections fail to meet the high standard necessary to merit reconsideration in this Circuit. See Schrader, 70 F.3d at 257; see also Marrero Pichardo v. Ashcroft, 374 F.3d 46, 55 (2d Cir. 2004) (noting that motions for reconsideration are “generally not favored and [are] properly granted only upon a showing of exceptional circumstances”). Indeed, to the extent the Court has been able to decipher this submission, Annan appears to simply repeat arguments raised and rejected in his first five sets of objections.

For this reason and those articulated in the Court’s December 29 Order, Annan’s motion for reconsideration is once again denied. Annan is advised that the Court will strike any further repetitive submissions. Annan is again cautioned against filing further voluminous, incomprehensible submissions, which will only delay the Court’s efforts to advance this action to trial.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 12, 2016
Brooklyn, New York

s/Carol Bagley Amon


Carol Bagley Amon
Chief United States District Judge